Blood pressure variability and risk of heart failure in ACCORD and the VADT

Daniel S. Nuyujukian, Ph.D., M.P.H.*^{1,2}

Juraj Koska, M.D., Ph.D.²

Gideon Bahn, Ph.D.³

Peter D. Reaven, M.D.²

Jin J. Zhou, Ph.D.¹

For the VADT Investigators

Author affiliations:

1. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

2. Carl T. Hayden VA Medical Center, Phoenix, AZ

3. Hines VA Cooperative Studies Program Coordinating Center, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, IL

*** Correspondence to**

**Daniel S. Nuyujukian, PhD, MPH
Postdoctoral Research Associate
Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health
University of Arizona
1295 N. Martin Ave.
Tucson, AZ 85724
Tel: 602-277-5551 x2942
Email: daniel.nuyujukian@va.gov**

Word count: 4,173

Number of tables: 2

Number of figures: 2

Abstract

Objective: Although blood pressure variability is increasingly appreciated as a risk factor for cardiovascular disease, its relationship with heart failure is less clear. We examined the relationship between blood pressure variability and risk of heart failure (HF) in two cohorts of type 2 diabetes participating in trials of glucose and/or other risk factor management.

Research Design and Methods: Data were drawn from the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial and the Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT). Coefficient of variation (CV) and average real variability (ARV) were calculated for systolic (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) along with maximum and cumulative mean SBP and DBP during both trials.

Results: In ACCORD, CV and ARV of SBP and DBP were associated with increased risk of HF, even after adjusting for other risk factors and mean blood pressure (e.g., CV-SBP: HR=1.15, $p = 0.01$; CV-DBP: HR=1.18, $p = 0.003$). In the VADT, DBP variability was associated with increased risk of HF (ARV-DBP: HR=1.16, $p = 0.001$; CV-DBP: HR=1.09, $p = 0.04$). Further, in ACCORD, those with progressively lower baseline blood pressure demonstrated a stepwise increase in risk of HF with higher CV-SBP, ARV-SBP, and CV-DBP. Effects of blood pressure variability were related to dips, not elevations, in blood pressure.

Conclusions: Blood pressure variability is associated with HF risk in individuals with type 2 diabetes, possibly a consequence of periods of ischemia during diastole. These results may have implications for optimizing blood pressure treatment strategies in those with type 2 diabetes.

In the last decade, visit-to-visit variability in blood pressure has evolved from being regarded as merely a hindrance to proper monitoring of mean blood pressure to being recognized as a potential additional risk factor for cardiovascular disease and mortality.^{1,2} Results from several cohort studies³⁻⁶ reveal that visit-to-visit variability in systolic (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) is closely associated with risk of coronary heart disease, stroke, and both cardiovascular and all-cause mortality.

Despite this recent evidence for a role of visit-to-visit blood pressure variability in ischemic cardiac events and mortality, inquiry into its role in heart failure (HF), a serious condition with increasing prevalence, is limited.^{5,7} HF is a common comorbidity in patients with type 2 diabetes⁸ and among those with HF the prevalence of concomitant type 2 diabetes rose 3.8% each year from 1979-1999.⁹ Type 2 diabetes patients have rates of HF approximately 2.5-fold higher than persons without type 2 diabetes.^{10,11} In light of this mounting public health problem, how visit-to-visit blood pressure variability may influence risk of HF among type 2 diabetes patients merits careful examination. Exploring this association in the context of aggressive blood pressure lowering is of particular clinical interest. As recent findings suggest that low SBP⁷ or DBP¹² may also be linked to adverse cardiovascular outcomes, determining the extent to which blood pressure variability influences HF at different blood pressure levels may be of further prognostic importance.

For these reasons, we examined the relationship between visit-to-visit blood pressure variability and HF using two large type 2 diabetes cohorts: the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial and the Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT). These trials have the advantage of frequent and carefully measured blood pressure assessments and adjudicated HF events, rendering them ideal cohorts for this research question.

Research Design and Methods

Study Design and Participants

The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial was a double two-by-two factorial, parallel treatment trial in which patients were randomly assigned to receive intensive glucose lowering targeting an HbA1c concentration of less than 6.0% or standard treatment targeting an HbA1c of 7.0-7.9%, and to distinct blood pressure and lipid interventions arms. ACCORD included participants with type 2 diabetes, HbA1c concentrations of 7.5% or more, and who were aged 40-79 years with a history of cardiovascular disease or 55-79 years with evidence of significant atherosclerosis, albuminuria, left ventricular hypertrophy, or at least two risk factors for cardiovascular disease (dyslipidemia, hypertension, smoking, or obesity). Of the 10,251 participants in the entire ACCORD population, 4,733 were randomized to two blood pressure intervention arms: an intensive blood pressure arm with a goal of reducing SBP to <120 mmHg, and a standard blood pressure arm with a goal of reducing SBP to <140 mmHg; the goal was to determine whether a strategy with a more aggressive blood pressure target would confer reduction in the rate of CVD events. Blood pressure measurements were available at baseline and at four-month intervals thereafter in the standard group and two-month intervals in the intensive group. Details of the ACCORD trial's overall design^{13,14} and the rationale for the blood pressure intervention, including a description of the treatment protocol,¹⁵ have been previously reported.

The current post-hoc analysis included those who did and did not participate in the blood pressure trial. For consistency among all ACCORD participants we included in the current analysis only data from the four-month visits. To reduce the effect of rapid reduction in blood

pressure at the early phase of the ACCORD trial on blood pressure variability measures, we excluded blood pressure observations from the baseline visit in this analysis.

The Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT) was a randomized trial that enrolled 1,791 U.S. veterans who had a suboptimal response to therapy for type 2 diabetes ($\text{HbA1c} > 7.5\%$) to receive either intensive or standard glucose control. The design and the principal results have been described previously.¹⁶ Following an established algorithm, the two groups were treated with similar glucose lowering medications (but different doses) with a goal of the intensive treatment group of achieving near normal glucose control. Other cardiovascular risk factors, including blood pressure, were targeted similarly in both groups to achieve guideline recommended levels at that time. To reduce the effect of rapid reduction in blood pressure, which occurred during the general risk factor management in the early phase of the trial, we excluded the baseline and three-month visit blood pressure observations in this analysis. In both cohorts, we also excluded those who had two or fewer blood pressure measurements.

Outcome

New heart failure was queried at each site visit and defined as “congestive heart failure” death or hospitalization for heart failure, documented with clinical and radiologic evidence and confirmed by an adjudication committee in ACCORD.¹³ In the VADT, “congestive heart failure” was characterized by new or worsening heart failure as determined by clinical questionnaire and physical exam and adjudicated by an end-point committee.¹⁶ Participants with known HF at baseline were excluded from this analysis.

Blood Pressure Variables

In a comprehensive analysis of the relationships of various blood pressure variability metrics, it was determined that many were significantly correlated and that only one measure of overall variability such as standard deviation (SD) or coefficient of variation (CV), one measure of variability between consecutive visits (e.g., average real variability, ARV), and at least one measure of extreme values would adequately characterize blood pressure variability.¹⁷

Therefore, we report CV and ARV in this analysis and compare these with maximum and cumulative mean (average of blood pressure before the event or censor time) of SBP and DBP.

Statistical Analysis

Data are expressed as means (SD) for continuous variables or as numbers and percentages for categorical variables. Differences between patients who did and did not develop a HF event were analyzed using the Wilcoxon test for continuous variables and the χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate, for categorical variables. To assess in more detail the role of blood pressure variability in HF, we reported age-adjusted hazard ratios (HRs) for HF across quartiles of CV-SBP, ARV-SBP, CV-DBP, and ARV-DBP in ACCORD.

Cox proportional hazards models in both trials were used to evaluate time-dependent effects of blood pressure measures on HF. HRs for all variables were standardized to a change of one SD. The SDs of time-dependent measures were calculated at every time point for all participants then averaged over all time points. Three models for variability were reported. Model 1 adjusted for age only. Model 2 adjusted for age and covariates reflecting significant baseline differences between those who did and did not develop HF. Model 3 adjusted for Model 2 covariates and added cumulative mean of blood pressure; this model was used to

determine whether variability measures provided information beyond standard blood pressure measures.

As it has been hypothesized previously that non-adherence to medications may explain heretofore reported relationships between blood pressure variability and adverse cardiovascular outcomes,^{5,18} we conducted sensitivity analyses to determine the extent to which use, and adherence to, blood pressure medications influences the variability-HF relationship.

Several subgroup analyses in ACCORD were performed. To test whether blood pressure variability confers increased HF risk in the setting of lower blood pressure, we tested these associations after stratifying by baseline SBP (<140 mmHg, <130 mmHg, <120 mmHg) and baseline DBP (<70 mmHg, <60 mmHg). Because the deleterious relationship of low DBP with myocardial injury in a previous study was only present in individuals with high pulse pressure¹² we also examined pulse pressure as a covariate in ACCORD.

We also used cumulative mean of SBP and DBP, rather than baseline blood pressure, as cutoffs in a separate analysis of those with low blood pressure. To determine whether variability above the mean blood pressure (i.e., elevations) or variability below the mean blood pressure (i.e., dips) conferred risk of HF, we calculated areas under the curve of these (hereafter, “variability area”), respectively, and tested for associations with the outcome. Finally, among the low blood pressure individuals we assessed the association between blood pressure variability and a) HF in those who did and did not report a baseline history of CVD and b) myocardial infarction occurring during the study.

All statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.6.1 (<https://www.r-project.org>). A two-sided $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Results

Following exclusions for history of HF at baseline and those with too few visits, a total of 9,383 individuals in ACCORD and 1,550 individuals in the VADT were included in this analysis. Mean follow-up time to HF event or censorship in ACCORD was 56.6 months; mean follow-up time in the VADT was 59.5 months. Over the study periods, a HF event occurred in 313 individuals in ACCORD and 102 individuals in the VADT. **Supplementary Figure 1** shows the mean SBP and DBP over the entire study duration in both trials, illustrating the initial drop in blood pressures during the early trial phase.

Blood Pressure Variability and HF in ACCORD

Baseline characteristics among ACCORD participants who did and did not have a HF event are presented in **Table 1**. Baseline age, sex, race/ethnicity, diabetes duration, history of CVD, smoking history, body mass index (BMI), DBP, SBP, HDL cholesterol, glycated hemoglobin, urine albumin to creatinine ratio (UACR), and glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) differed significantly between those who did and did not have a HF event.

To assess the relationship between blood pressure variation and incident HF in ACCORD, we first determined HRs across quartiles of blood pressure variability (**Figure 1**). There was a strong, significant trend of increasing HF risk with increasing quartiles of both SBP and DBP variability.

We then evaluated measures of blood pressure variability, as well as mean and maximum blood pressure, as predictors of HF in ACCORD in adjusted models (**Table 2**). In age-adjusted models (Model 1), mean and maximum SBP, CV-SBP, and ARV-SBP significantly predicted risk of HF. For DBP measures, only measures of variability (CV-DBP and ARV-DBP) were

significant risk factors for HF. All blood pressure measures that were significant predictors in Model 1 remained significant after further adjustment for variables that differed between those who did and did not develop a HF event (Model 2). To examine whether measures of blood pressure variability provided information beyond standard measures of blood pressure, estimates were further adjusted for cumulative blood pressure means (SBP or DBP) (Model 3). While SBP and DBP variability measures remained significant predictors of HF, maximum SBP was no longer significant in Model 3. The risk estimates for the measures of blood pressure variability were not appreciably changed after adjustment for pulse pressure (e.g, model 3 + pulse pressure, CV-DBP HR = 1.21, $p < 0.001$; ARV-DBP HR = 1.19, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, the relationship of blood pressure variability with HF was *not* stronger in those with high baseline pulse pressure (> 60 mmHg).

In a series of sensitivity analyses we addressed whether the associations could be driven in part by use of antihypertensive medications. Blood pressure variability (in SBP and DBP) was significantly greater in the high antihypertensive use groups at the end of year 1 (i.e., use of 2-3 and 4 or more medications) than in the 0-1 medications group ($p < 0.001$ for CV and ARV); however, the association between blood pressure variability and HF was not stronger in those with more medication use. There were no major differences in percentages of antihypertensive medication use per category of medication use at years 1, 2 and 3; nor was the association between variability and HF markedly different if we instead analyzed the population beginning at year 1.

We also examined the effects of blood pressure variability stratified by participation in the blood pressure trial arms and observed that the relationship of SBP and DBP variability (CV and ARV) with incident HF was not just limited to those participating in the blood pressure trial

(Supplementary Table 1). Furthermore, participants in the ACCORD blood pressure trial were highly adherent (>93%) to their trial medications (defined as taking 80-100% of their trial medications at each visit) and adjusting for medication adherence among those in the blood pressure arms did not noticeably influence the results. We did not see major differences in the results when stratifying by sex. Moreover, adjusting for randomization to the glucose or blood pressure treatment arms of ACCORD had negligible effects on the results.

Blood Pressure Variability and HF in the VADT

In the VADT, age, race, diabetes duration, history of CVD, pack-years of smoking, SBP, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, UACR, and eGFR differed significantly between those who did and did not develop a new HF event (**Supplementary Table 2**). The associations between DBP variability measures and HF (**Supplementary Table 3**) were consistent with the ACCORD findings (Model 3: CV-DBP HR = 1.09, 95% CI = 1.00-1.14, $p = 0.04$; ARV-DBP HR = 1.16, 95% CI = 1.06-1.27, $p = 0.002$). The elevated HRs for the SBP variability and HF association were not statistically significant. When excluding the small number of women in the VADT, we did not see major differences in the results. Of note, there was an inverse association with both maximum SBP (HR = 0.92) and maximum DBP (HR = 0.81) in the fully-adjusted models ($p < 0.001$), suggesting higher HF risk in those with lower blood pressure.

Blood Pressure Variability and HF in the Setting of Lower Blood Pressure in ACCORD

Because of insufficient statistical power for stratified analyses in the VADT, the effect of blood pressure variability by categories of baseline blood pressure was examined in ACCORD only. The age-adjusted risk for HF increased for CV-SBP, ARV-SBP, and CV-DBP with

stepwise declines in baseline blood pressure, as displayed in **Figure 2** (e.g., for CV-SBP in Model 1: those with baseline SBP ≥ 140 , < 140 , < 130 and < 120 mmHg, respectively had the following HRs; 1.03, $p = 0.67$; 1.21, $p = 0.002$; 1.50, $p < 0.001$; and 1.69, $p < 0.001$). When mean blood pressure during the study, rather than baseline blood pressure, was used to divide the groups, there was a similar pattern of greater risk of HF with increased blood pressure variability in those with lower mean blood pressure. Although we have examined low SBP and DBP separately, we recognize that there is extensive overlap between those with low baseline SBP and DBP. In fact, over 80% of individuals with lower DBP (< 70 mmHg) also had SBP < 140 mmHg. When considering those with and without CVD history in the low baseline blood pressure group (DBP < 70 mmHg and SBP < 140 mmHg) the highest risk for blood pressure variability measures was seen among those with a history of CVD while the associations were not significant in those without a CVD history (**Supplementary Table 4**). To explore the possibility that this may be related to cardiac ischemia, we tested whether blood pressure variability in progressively lower levels of blood pressure is also associated with development of a non-fatal myocardial infarction (MI). Interestingly, we saw similar trends as in the analysis for HF (e.g., CV-SBP for non-fatal MI in those with baseline SBP > 140 mmHg in comparison to those with SBP < 120 mmHg increases from HR = 1.06, $p = 0.36$ to HR = 1.36, $p = 0.0009$). Risk of MI associated with CV-DBP across strata of blood pressure showed a similar pattern.

Finally, to examine whether the direction of blood pressure variability may influence outcomes, we determined whether variability above the mean cumulative SBP or DBP or variability below the mean cumulative SBP or DBP was more associated with risk of HF in the fully-adjusted model 3. We observed that variability area under the mean ($p = 0.03$ and $p <$

0.001 for both SBP and DBP, respectively) but not variability area above the mean ($p = 0.92$ and $p = 0.17$ for SBP and DBP, respectively) represented a significant risk for HF.

Conclusions

There is substantial evidence that HF represents an increasing burden in those with type 2 diabetes.¹⁹ While elevated blood pressure is appreciated as one of several cardiovascular risk factors for type 2 diabetes,²⁰ it is essential to clarify the impact of blood pressure variability in those with type 2 diabetes.²¹ In this study, we demonstrate that blood pressure variability is a significant and robust predictor of HF using two large cohorts of type 2 diabetes patients who had participated in clinical trials of glucose and other cardiovascular risk factor management. We showed that these relationships were present even in the setting of well-controlled management of other type 2 diabetes risk factors and in those undergoing additional blood pressure lowering treatment. Importantly, the association of DBP variability and HF persisted after adjustment for overall levels of blood pressure in both cohorts, and it was strongest in those with lower baseline (or on study) blood pressure in ACCORD. These findings may support use of relatively easily accessible visit-to-visit blood pressure variability assessments to improve risk factor stratification and further individualization of blood pressure treatment strategies.

Prior studies have reported associations of blood pressure variability and adverse cardiovascular outcomes, including stroke,²² myocardial infarction,³ and mortality.¹ More recent studies also indicated associations between blood pressure variability and HF. In the ALLHAT trial of antihypertensive control, both SBP and DBP variability were associated with a 25% increase in risk of HF (highest versus lowest quintile of SD); this however was not significant in the fully-adjusted model.⁵ The VALUE trial indicated greater risk of HF and death due to HF in

those with increased blood pressure variability.⁷ In both trials, over a third of participants reported having diabetes, suggesting this relationship could be relevant in both diabetes and non-diabetes patients.

The current study builds on this previous work in several ways. We report the association of SBP and DBP variability with HF in two large cohorts of individuals with type 2 diabetes, a population at very high risk for HF. These associations were sufficiently robust in ACCORD to persist after adjustment for baseline differences (including CVD history) between those who do or do not develop HF (Model 2) and further adjustment for cumulative mean blood pressure or pulse pressure. This pattern held for DBP, but not SBP, variability in the VADT, possibly due to the smaller cohort size. In addition, these associations do not appear to be explained by use of, and adherence to, antihypertensive medications or enrollment in the blood pressure lowering trial, as demonstrated in sensitivity analyses in ACCORD.

We found in ACCORD that increased variability in those with lower baseline blood pressures conferred increased risk of HF in a nearly stepwise fashion. Although using a different endpoint (total cardiovascular events), the VALUE trial also found that associations of blood pressure variability with this outcome were stronger in patients with lower baseline SBP.⁷ There is recent evidence emphasizing that individuals with DBP in the low normal or less than low normal may be at higher risk of CVD. Anderson and colleagues reported in the VADT that even with SBP in range of guideline targets, baseline DBP < 70 mmHg in asymptomatic individuals with type 2 diabetes was associated with increased CVD risk.²³ Similarly, McEvoy and colleagues found in the ARIC community study that low DBP in otherwise healthy individuals was associated in a stepwise manner with increased risk for future myocardial damage as estimated by elevations in high-sensitivity cardiac troponin-T concentrations.¹² However, it is

important to note that recent blood pressure lowering trials^{24,25} found that lower blood pressure treatment targets conferred decreased (or no) risk for HF. As our data suggest greater potential impact of blood pressure variability in the lower blood pressure range, one interpretation of the data in aggregate is that reducing variability could enhance the benefits of blood pressure lowering, particularly at lower blood pressure target levels.

Several mechanisms have been put forward to account for the association between visit-to-visit blood pressure variability and adverse cardiovascular outcomes. These include decreased endothelial function²⁶ as well as increased arterial stiffness. Importantly, arterial stiffness was found to correlate with variability of SBP and DBP in a study of participants with untreated hypertension.²⁷ Similarly, others reported decreased aortic distensibility with increased blood pressure variability in the MESA community cohort.²⁸ As both endothelial dysfunction and arterial stiffness have been implicated in development of CVD, they could also be plausible contributors to development of HF. However, it is unlikely that these two processes would be most prominent in the low blood pressure setting, nor did our results suggest that the association of blood pressure variability and HF was confined to those with high pulse pressure—a relatively good indicator of arterial stiffness.²⁹ An additional possibility is that blood pressure variability may more directly increase risk for myocardial ischemia. As coronary blood flow peaks during diastole, repeated transient declines in DBP over time may put cardiac tissue at increased risk of relative hypoperfusion. Our analysis showing an increasing level of risk from higher blood pressure variability for non-fatal MI with progressively lower levels of blood pressure provides further support for this hypothesis.

Although our study finds the risk for HF with higher blood pressure variability is increased in those with either low SBP and DBP, these lower pressures occur in the same

individuals. Thus, our findings are still consistent with the notion that blood pressure variation may exacerbate effects of low DBP. This concept is also supported by our findings that (1) DBP variability was more consistently and robustly associated with incident HF than SBP variability, (2) that this association was strongest in those also with low baseline or on-trial DBP, and (3) downward but not upward changes in blood pressure were related to risk for HF. It could be further anticipated that underlying atherosclerotic disease may exacerbate the adverse effect of higher blood pressure variability in the setting of low blood pressure, as suggested by our finding of a more prominent effect in those with a CVD history and low DBP.

Although substantial attention has been paid to SBP and DBP lowering, recent antihypertensive guidelines have begun to consider implications of low blood pressure management in apparently healthy individuals. As noted in the 2017 position statement of the American Diabetes Association,³⁰ treatment recommendations for SBP among older adults ought to be tempered by accumulating evidence that accompanying reductions in DBP may lead to unfavorable outcomes. Our results provide additional clinically relevant information to this notion, indicating that DBP variability in those with low baseline DBP may be particularly deleterious. However, as noted above, results from both ACCORD²⁴ and the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT)²⁵ did not suggest that lowering blood pressure per se in those already with elevated blood pressures led to higher incidence of HF. Thus, our data do not alter conclusions arising from these trials. It will be informative, however, to re-examine whether outcomes in blood pressure studies such as these appear modulated by restraining the extent of blood pressure variability. More detailed studies clarifying the role of blood pressure variability, and the relevant mechanisms, in development of HF are clearly needed to help refine our understanding of, and guidance for, optimal blood pressure management.

Strengths of the current study include use of two large randomized clinical trials that included large numbers of blood pressure measures, long-term follow-up, and careful and blinded adjudication of HF events. We were also able in ACCORD to account for key medication factors including use of, and adherence to, antihypertensive therapies which have been hypothesized to influence variability. Moreover, use of time-dependent estimates in our Cox model has some advantages over “landmark period” approaches commonly used in other observational studies of blood pressure variability. For example, use of time-dependent estimates permits inclusion of all blood pressure measures up until the HF event³¹ which will presumably more accurately quantify blood pressure variation. The landmark approach also assumes that variation captured in the initial landmark period of the study will reflect variation during the subsequent observational period of the study.

We also note some limitations of the study. While the older, relatively homogenous patient populations in the VADT and ACCORD are at high risk for HF, the external validity of the current post-hoc results may be limited and will require validation in other cohorts. The ACCORD population was extremely adherent to their medications, tempering our ability to test nuances in medication adherence in this context. The small numbers of HF events in the VADT precluded conducting stratified analyses as in ACCORD.

In conclusion, this study finds associations between visit-to-visit blood pressure variability and HF within ACCORD and the VADT. The associations in ACCORD persisted for both SBP and DBP variability and in the VADT for DBP variability when accounting for overall blood pressure control. Our study adds to the current literature that links blood pressure variability with adverse cardiovascular outcomes in those with type 2 diabetes²¹ and provides additional evidence for an association of blood pressure variability with HF risk in diabetes. The

novel finding that the association was stronger in those with low baseline blood pressures merits inquiry in future studies and may assist efforts to better individualize blood pressure strategies to maximize benefits while limiting harm.

Acknowledgements and author contributions

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the contributions of the Hines VA Cooperative Studies Program Coordinating Center. The contents of this study do not represent the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States Government.

Funding

This work was supported by the Veterans Affairs Cooperative Studies Program. Additional support was received from the National Institutes of Health (grants R01-067690 and R01-094775 to P.D.R. and grant K01-DK-106116 to J.J.Z.).

Duality of interest

No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported.

Author contributions

All authors provided edits and comments on manuscript drafts. P.D.R. was a principal investigator in, and is an executive committee member of, the VADT. D.S.N., J.K., P.D.R., and J.J.Z. contributed to the conception and design of the work and interpreted the data. D.S.N., J.K., and J.J.Z. conducted data analysis. D.S.N., J.K., and P.D.R. wrote the manuscript. G.B. advised on statistical methods and participated in acquisition of the data. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript. J.J.Z. is the guarantor of this work and as such had full

access to all the data in the study and, along with D.S.N., takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Hazard ratio (HR) estimates for risk of HF by quartiles of blood pressure variability in ACCORD; coefficient of variation (CV) and average real variability (ARV) of blood pressure, adjusted for age. SBP in top panel, DBP in lower panel. Results of trend tests are presented as text annotation in the figure.

Figure 2: Associations of visit-to-visit systolic and diastolic variability with risk of HF, hazard ratio (HR) estimates, by baseline blood pressure categories in ACCORD. (a) CV-SBP by baseline SBP categories; (b) ARV-SBP by baseline SBP categories; (c) CV-DBP by baseline DBP categories; (d) ARV-DBP by baseline DBP categories.

Supplemental Figure 1: Plot of mean SBP and DBP in (a) ACCORD and (b) the VADT.

References

1. Stevens SL, Wood S, Koshiaris C, et al. Blood pressure variability and cardiovascular disease: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2016. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4098
2. Rothwell PM. Limitations of the usual blood-pressure hypothesis and importance of variability, instability, and episodic hypertension. *Lancet*. 2010;375(9718):938-948. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60309-1
3. Suchy-Dicey AM, Wallace ER, Mitchell SVE, et al. Blood pressure variability and the risk of all-cause mortality, incident myocardial infarction, and incident stroke in the cardiovascular health study. *Am J Hypertens*. 2013. doi:10.1093/ajh/hpt092
4. Arashi H, Ogawa H, Yamaguchi JI, Kawada-Watanabe E, Hagiwara N. Impact of Visit-to-Visit Variability and Systolic Blood Pressure Control on Subsequent Outcomes in Hypertensive Patients With Coronary Artery Disease (from the HIJ-CREATE Substudy). *Am J Cardiol*. 2015. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2015.04.011
5. Muntner P, Whittle J, Lynch AI, et al. Visit-to-visit variability of blood pressure and coronary heart disease, stroke, heart failure, and mortality a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;163(5):329-338. doi:10.7326/M14-2803
6. Hsieh YT, Tu S Te, Cho TJ, Chang SJ, Chen JF, Hsieh MC. Visit-to-visit variability in blood pressure strongly predicts all-cause mortality in patients with type 2 diabetes: A 5·5-year prospective analysis. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2012. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2362.2011.02574.x
7. Mehlum MH, Liestøl K, Kjeldsen SE, et al. Blood pressure variability and risk of cardiovascular events and death in patients with hypertension and different baseline risks. *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39(24):2243-2251. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehx760

8. Jorsal A, Wiggers H, McMurray JJV. Heart Failure: Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, and Management of Heart Failure in Diabetes Mellitus. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am*. 2018. doi:10.1016/j.ecl.2017.10.007
9. From AM, Leibson CL, Bursi F, et al. Diabetes in Heart Failure: Prevalence and Impact on Outcome in the Population. *Am J Med*. 2006. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2006.05.024
10. Kannel WB, Hjortland M, Castelli WP. Role of diabetes in congestive heart failure: The Framingham study. *Am J Cardiol*. 1974. doi:10.1016/0002-9149(74)90089-7
11. Nichols GA, Gullion CM, Koro CE, Ephross SA, Brown JB. The incidence of congestive heart failure in type 2 diabetes: An update. *Diabetes Care*. 2004. doi:10.2337/diacare.27.8.1879
12. McEvoy JW, Chen Y, Rawlings A, et al. Diastolic Blood Pressure, Subclinical Myocardial Damage, and Cardiac Events: Implications for Blood Pressure Control. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;68(16):1713-1722. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.07.754
13. Buse JB, Friedewald WT, Bigger JT, et al. Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial: Design and methods. *Am J Cardiol*. 2007. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2007.03.003
14. Group AS. Effects of Intensive Blood-Pressure Control in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(17):1575-1585. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1001286
15. Cushman WC, Grimm RH, Cutler JA, et al. Rationale and Design for the Blood Pressure Intervention of the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) Trial. *Am J Cardiol*. 2007. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2007.03.005
16. Duckworth W, Abraira C, Moritz T, et al. Glucose control and vascular complications in veterans with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med*. 2009. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0808431
17. Levitan EB, Kaciroti N, Oparil S, Julius S, Muntner P. Relationships between metrics of visit-to-visit variability of blood pressure. *J Hum Hypertens*. 2013. doi:10.1038/jhh.2013.19
18. Krakoff LR. Fluctuation: Does blood pressure variability matter? *Circulation*. 2012;126(5):525-527. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.112.124750
19. Bui AL, Horwich TB, Fonarow GC. Epidemiology and risk profile of heart failure. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2011. doi:10.1038/nrcardio.2010.165
20. Sowers JR, Epstein M, Frohlich ED. Diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease an update. *Hypertension*. 2001. doi:10.1161/01.HYP.37.4.1053
21. Chiriacò M, Pateras K, Virdis A, et al. Association between blood pressure variability, cardiovascular disease and mortality in type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2019. doi:10.1111/dom.13828
22. Rothwell PM, Howard SC, Dolan E, et al. Prognostic significance of visit-to-visit variability, maximum systolic blood pressure, and episodic hypertension. *Lancet*. 2010. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60308-X
23. Anderson RJ, Bahn GD, Moritz TE, Kaufman D, Abraira C, Duckworth W. Blood pressure and cardiovascular disease risk in the Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2011. doi:10.2337/dc10-1420
24. Cushman WC, Evans GW, Byington RP, et al. Effects of intensive blood-pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med*. 2010. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1001286
25. Wright JT, Williamson JD, Whelton PK, et al. A randomized trial of intensive versus standard blood-pressure control. *N Engl J Med*. 2015. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1511939
26. Diaz KM, Veerabhadrapa P, Kashem MA, et al. Relationship of visit-to-visit and

- ambulatory blood pressure variability to vascular function in African Americans. *Hypertens Res.* 2012. doi:10.1038/hr.2011.135
27. Lee HT, Lim YH, Kim BK, et al. The relationship between ambulatory arterial stiffness index and blood pressure variability in hypertensive patients. *Korean Circ J.* 2011. doi:10.4070/kcj.2011.41.5.235
 28. Shimbo D, Shea S, McClelland RL, et al. Associations of aortic distensibility and arterial elasticity with long-term visit-to-visit blood pressure variability: The multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis (MESA). *Am J Hypertens.* 2013. doi:10.1093/ajh/hpt040
 29. Safar ME, Levy BI, Struijker-Boudier H. Current perspectives on arterial stiffness and pulse pressure in hypertension and cardiovascular diseases. *Circulation.* 2003. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000069826.36125.B4
 30. De Boer IH, Bangalore S, Benetos A, et al. Diabetes and hypertension: A position statement by the American diabetes association. *Diabetes Care.* 2017. doi:10.2337/dci17-0026
 31. De Courson H, Leffondré K, Tzourio C. Blood pressure variability and risk of cardiovascular event: Is it appropriate to use the future for predicting the present? *Eur Heart J.* 2018;39(47):4220. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehy825

Table 1. Baseline characteristics in ACCORD by incident HF status.

	No (n = 9,070)	Yes (n=313)	P-value
Age (years)	62.6 (6.5)	65.5 (6.8)	<0.001
Intensive BP treatment (% Yes)	2,105 (23.2)	58 (18.5)	0.06
Female (% Yes)	3,507 (38.7)	96 (30.7)	0.005
Race (%)			0.001
White	5,634 (62.1)	217 (69.3)	
Black	1,707 (18.8)	64 (20.4)	
Hispanic	654 (7.2)	15 (4.8)	
Other	1,075 (11.9)	17 (5.4)	
Diabetes duration (years)	10.6 (7.5)	12.8 (8.4)	<0.001
History of CVD (% Yes)	2,912 (32.1)	177 (56.5)	<0.001
Smoker[†] (% Yes)	4,034 (51.0)	163 (60.1)	0.004
BMI (kg/m²)	32.1 (5.4)	33.2 (5.6)	0.001
DBP (mmHg)	75 (10)	73 (11)	<0.001
SBP (mmHg)	136 (17)	139 (19)	0.001
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	42 (12)	39 (11)	<0.001
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	105 (34)	102 (34)	0.15
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)	183 (42)	179 (41)	0.06
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	190 (150)	197 (127)	0.37
HbA1c (%)	8.3 (1.1)	8.6 (1.1)	<0.001
Urine albumin to creatinine ratio (mg/g)	88.8 (337.1)	260.7 (666.0)	<0.001
eGFR (ml/min/1.73 m²)	91.8 (27.3)	84.8 (23.4)	<0.001

BMI: body mass index; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; SBP: systolic blood pressure; HDL: High-density lipoprotein; LDL: Low-density lipoprotein; CVD: cardiovascular disease; eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate from four variable Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study (MDRD) equation.

At 1 year, HbA1c values of 6.4% and 7.5% were achieved in intensive and standard groups, respectively, and remained relatively stable thereafter.

[†]smoker: smoked more than 100 cigarettes during lifetime.

Table 2. Hazard ratios for the association of blood pressure variables with HF estimated by Cox proportional hazards model in ACCORD ($n = 9,383$).

	Model-1 Age Adjustment		Model-2 Multivariate Adjustment		Model-3 Model 2 + Cumulative mean BP	
	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value
Cum. mean SBP	1.03 (1.02-1.04)	<0.001	1.02 (1.01-1.04)	0.001	-	-
Cum. max SBP	1.25 (1.19-1.32)	<0.001	1.22 (1.07-1.38)	0.002	1.09 (0.90-1.31)	0.37
CV-SBP	1.24 (1.13-1.35)	<0.001	1.15 (1.04-1.28)	0.009	1.15 (1.03-1.29)	0.01
ARV-SBP	1.26 (1.16-1.37)	<0.001	1.18 (1.06-1.30)	0.002	1.19 (1.07-1.32)	0.001
Cum. mean DBP	0.99 (0.97-1.00)	0.13	1.00 (0.97-1.03)	0.90	-	-
Cum. max DBP	1.03 (0.92-1.15)	0.63	1.07 (0.93-1.24)	0.35	-	-
CV-DBP	1.27 (1.17-1.38)	<0.001	1.18 (1.06-1.31)	0.003	1.18 (1.06-1.32)	0.003
ARV-DBP	1.24 (1.15-1.34)	<0.001	1.18 (1.06-1.31)	0.002	1.18 (1.06-1.31)	0.002

Hazard ratios (HR) (95% confidence interval (95% CI)), and p-values estimated by Cox proportional hazards model in ACCORD. Those with history of heart failure at baseline were excluded. Blood pressure variables that were significant in age-adjusted models (Model-1) were further adjusted for baseline factors that showed significant associations in Table 1 (Model-2). In Model-3, models were additionally adjusted for cumulative mean of blood pressure. Model 3 not computed if Model 2 HR not statistically significant. P-values <0.05 (bold font) are considered significant. CV: coefficient of variation; ARV: average real variability

Supplementary Figure 1.

Supplementary Table 1. HRs for blood pressure variables and risk of CHF in the treated and non-treated groups, ACCORD.

	Model-1		Model-2		Model-3	
	Age Adjustment		Multivariate Adjustment		Model 2 + cumulative mean BP	
	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value
CV-SBP	1.10 (0.94-1.29)	0.24	1.10 (0.92-1.33)	0.30	1.14 (0.95-1.38)	0.16
ARV-SBP	1.18 (1.00-1.37)	0.04	1.18 (0.99-1.41)	0.07	1.20 (1.01-1.43)	0.04
CV-DBP	1.24 (1.07-1.45)	0.006	1.12 (0.93-1.34)	0.24	1.12 (0.93-1.35)	0.09
ARV-DBP	1.20 (1.03-1.41)	0.02	1.10 (0.92-1.32)	0.29	1.11 (0.92-1.32)	0.27
Non-BP arm						
CV-SBP	1.31 (1.19-1.43)	<0.001	1.22 (1.07-1.39)	0.003	1.28 (1.12-1.50)	<0.001
ARV-SBP	1.29 (1.19-1.41)	<0.001	1.22 (1.08-1.38)	0.001	1.27 (1.12-1.44)	<0.001
CV-DBP	1.28 (1.17-1.40)	<0.001	1.25 (1.10-1.43)	<0.001	1.25 (1.10-1.42)	<0.001
ARV-DBP	1.25 (1.15-1.36)	<0.001	1.24 (1.10-1.40)	<0.001	1.24 (1.10-1.40)	<0.001

Blood pressure variables that were significant in age-adjusted models (Model-1) were further adjusted for baseline factors that showed significant associations in Table 1 (Model-2). In Model-3, models were additionally adjusted for cumulative mean of blood pressure. P-values <0.05 (bold font) are considered significant. CV: coefficient of variation; ARV: average real variability. BP arm: those randomized to blood pressure lowering arm; Non-BP arm: those not participating in blood pressure lowering.

Supplementary Table 2. Baseline characteristics in the VADT by incident HF status.

	No (n=1,448)	Yes (n=102)	P-value
Age (years)	59.7 (8.5)	64.3 (8.5)	<0.0001
Intensive treatment (%)	50	46	0.54
Male (% Yes)	97	100	0.07
Non-Hispanic White (%)	60	79	<0.0001
Diabetes duration (years)	11 (7.5)	13 (7.3)	0.07
CVD History (%)	35	73	<0.0001
Hypertension History (%)	71	82	0.01
Smoking			0.91
Current smoker (%)	17	18	
Previous smoker (%)	56	53	
Pack-years	14 (0-40)	23 (0-55)	0.02
BMI (kg/m²)	31.2 (4.5)	32.0 (4.4)	0.09
SBP (mmHg)	131 (16)	136 (20)	0.02
DBP (mmHg)	76 (10)	75 (12)	0.31
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	36 (10)	33 (8)	<0.0001
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	108 (32)	109 (34)	0.78
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)	183 (44)	184 (40)	0.80
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	166 (78)	188 (89)	0.01
Glycated hemoglobin level (%)	9.4 (1.5)	9.6 (1.5)	0.07
Albumin to creatinine ratio (mg/g)			
(mg/g)	16 (6-56)	56.5 (21-205)	<0.0001
eGFR (ml/min/1.73 m²)	83 (22)	74 (19)	<0.0001

BMI: body mass index; DBP: diastolic blood pressure; SBP: systolic blood pressure; HDL: High-density lipoprotein; LDL: Low-density lipoprotein; CVD: Cardiovascular disease; eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate from Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study (MDRD) equation.

Data presented are mean, SD, or median (IQR) or %

After median of 5.6 years, HbA1c values of 6.9% in the intensive group and 8.4% in the standard group were achieved

Supplementary Table 3. Hazard ratios for the association of blood pressure variables with CHF estimated by Cox proportional hazards model in the VADT ($n = 1,550$).

	Model-1 Age Adjustment		Model-2 Multivariate Adjustment		Model-3 Model 2 + Cumulative mean BP	
	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value	HR (95% C.I.)	P-value
Cum. mean SBP	1.03 (1.02-1.05)	<0.001	1.03 (1.01-1.05)	0.02	-	-
Cum. max SBP	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	0.98	0.98 (0.97-1.00)	0.03	0.92 (0.89-0.94)	<0.001
CV-SBP	1.10 (0.92-1.32)	0.31	1.03 (0.85-1.24)	0.77	1.02 (0.85-1.23)	0.82
ARV-SBP	1.14 (0.95-1.36)	0.15	1.06 (0.88-1.27)	0.56	1.03 (0.86-1.24)	0.75
Cum. mean DBP	0.99 (0.96-1.03)	0.65	1.01 (0.97-1.05)	0.71	-	-
Cum. max DBP	0.95 (0.93-0.98)	<0.001	0.94 (0.91-0.97)	<0.001	0.81 (0.76-0.86)	<0.001
CV-DBP	1.14 (1.07-1.22)	<0.001	1.07 (0.99-1.16)	0.10	1.09 (1.00-1.18)	0.04
ARV-DBP	1.20 (1.11-1.30)	<0.001	1.16 (1.06-1.27)	0.001	1.16 (1.06-1.27)	0.001

Hazard ratios (HR) (95% confidence interval (95% CI)), and p-values estimated by Cox proportional hazards model in the VADT. Those with history of heart failure at baseline were excluded. Blood pressure variables that were significant in age-adjusted models (Model-1) were further adjusted for baseline factors that showed significant associations in Supplementary Table 2 (Model-2). In Model-3, models were additionally adjusted for cumulative mean of blood pressure. P-values <0.05 (bold font) are considered significant. CV: coefficient of variation; ARV: average real variability

Supplementary Table 4. Hazard ratios (HRs) for blood pressure variables and risk of CHF in those with and without a history of CVD and both DBP < 70 mmHg and SBP < 140 mmHg in ACCORD

	Model-1		Model-2		Model-3	
	Age Adjustment		Multivariate Adjustment		Model 2 + cumulative mean BP	
<i>With CVD hx</i>						
CV-SBP	HR (95% CI)	P<0.001	HR (95% CI)	P<0.001	HR (95% CI)	P<0.001
ARV-SBP	1.42 (1.17-1.73)	<0.001	1.39 (1.14-1.68)	<0.001	1.40 (1.15-1.70)	<0.001
CV-DBP	1.37 (1.22-1.53)	<0.001	1.39 (1.22-1.57)	<0.001	1.40 (1.23-1.60)	<0.001
ARV-DBP	1.31 (1.15-1.50)	<0.001	1.33 (1.15-1.53)	<0.001	1.33 (1.15-1.55)	<0.001
<i>Without CVD hx</i>						
CV-SBP	1.11 (0.81-1.52)	0.51	1.02 (0.73-1.42)	0.91	1.02 (0.73-1.41)	0.92
ARV-SBP	1.25 (0.95-1.65)	0.11	1.17 (0.88-1.55)	0.28	1.15 (0.87-1.53)	0.32
CV-DBP	1.19 (0.89-1.58)	0.24	1.17 (0.86-1.60)	0.32	1.13 (0.83-1.54)	0.42
ARV-DBP	1.21 (0.92-1.58)	0.17	1.19 (0.88-1.60)	0.24	1.16 (0.86-1.55)	0.33

CV: coefficient of variation; ARV: average real variability; top panel shows the result in those with CVD history at baseline, bottom panel shows the result in those without CVD history at baseline. P-values <0.05 (bold font) are considered significant

Supplementary Table 5. Definitions of measures of variability. Let X_{ij} denote the blood pressure value for subject i at visit j . Time dependent variability measures for subject i at visit j are defined as follows:

Measure		
Mean		$\bar{X}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^j X_{il}}{j}$
Var; SD	Variance; standard deviation	$\text{Var}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^j (X_{il} - \bar{X}_{ij})^2}{j-1}$ $\text{SD}_{ij} = \sqrt{\text{Var}_{ij}}$
CV	Coefficient of variation	$\frac{\text{SD}_{ij}}{\bar{X}_{ij}},$
ARV	Average real variability	$\frac{1}{j-1} \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{l+1} - X_l / \bar{X}_{ij}$